MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 16, 1924.

The seventh meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1924 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, May 16, 1924. The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Greenleaf,
Mr. Fraser,
Mr. Newbrey,
Mr. Medary,
Mr. Delano,
also Mr. C. M. Zimmerer, Secretary and Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the meeting held April 23, 1924, were approved.

2. UNITED STATES FLAG STANDARDIZATION: The Committee on Flag Standardization of the Department of Commerce met with the Commission of Fine Arts for a conference as to problems which had developed in the consideration of a standard design for the United States flag. The conference was the outcome of long consideration and several meetings held covering a period of over a year, and the result indicated that all points were agreed upon with the exception of the question of an alternate arrangement of the stars of the union. This was very gratifying to all present, as it involves a radical change in the manufacture of United States flags, and an improvement in the design. A report of the conference is attached to these minutes, and made a part thereof (Exhibit A).

3. TABLET FOR THE FRANCIS SCOTT KEY BRIDGE: Under date of May 13th Mr. Moore received a letter from Hon. John W. Weeks, Secretary of War, asking for comments as to a memorandum which he had received from the Chief of Engineers regarding the tablet for the Francis Scott Key Bridge, as follows:

War Department
Office of the Chief of Engineers
Washington

May 12, 1924.

Memorandum for the Secretary of War:

It is believed the following information should be furnished you:

As will be seen by the Act of Congress, approved January 30, 1924, copy inclosed herewith (Public No.6-68th Congress), (S.627), the National Society of United States Daughters of 1812 was authorized to place, on the Francis Scott Key Bridge across Potomac River, a bronze tablet, inscribed in the manner stated in the act.

This office has been informed by Mrs. C. F. Taylor-a member of the Society in local charge of the matter-and by Representative Abernathy that after this act had been passed and the Society had started its arrangements to install the bronze tablet, they were notified by Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission for the District of Columbia, that a bronze tablet would not be permitted and that they must install a marble tablet. Without bringing the matter to the attention of any officials of the District of Columbia or of the War Department, the Society made arrangements for Senator Caraway to introduce another resolution, authorizing the marble tablet. A copy of this resolution, which was approved March 17, 1924, is inclosed herewith (Public Resolution No.11-68th Congress) (S.J.Res.91).

Mr. Moore, in this case, declined to be guided by an act of Congress without consultation, as far as can be learned, with any government official, and it is understood that his action has involved the Society in a considerable extra expenditure.

It is believed that these facts should be known and made of record.

Lansing H. Beach,
Chief of Engineers.

2. Incls. Pub.Res.No.11,68th Cong.
Public No.6, 68th Congress.

Mr. Moore stated that the memorandum from the Chief of Engineers is very much at variance with the facts in the case; that the act approved January 30, 1924, provided that the tablet shall be erected under the supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; that the matter was considered by the Commission of Fine Arts at the meeting on

February 1, 1924, at which time the Commission visited the site and recommended a marble tablet instead of a bronze tablet; that on February 12th Commissioner Rudolph wrote to the Commission asking expedition in the matter, and that a reply was sent to him, also a letter to Senator Pepper, Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Library, setting forth the recommendations of the Commission as to a marble tablet; that Congress adopted a new act on March 17, 1924, providing for the erection of a marble tablet; and that the tablet was erected in time for the annual meeting of the National Society of the Daughters of 1812, on April 21, 1924; that all the work was done in harmony with the society, and that the marble tablet cost less than the bronze tablet would have cost them.

The Commission resented the statements made in the memorandum of the Chief of Engineers and particularly the attack on Mr. Moore. Mr. Medary said the whole action of the Commission is justified by the result, and he would suggest that while it is a fact that the work was done in entire harmony with the National Society of the Daughters of 1812, still he would have the Secretary of War informed that the Commission of Fine Arts regard it of more importance to do the thing right than to do it harmoniously; that as a Commission we know from whom we receive our authority, and in the performance of the functions it would have been negligent to do anything other than the Commission did in the matter. The Commission directed that the Chairman send a reply to the Secretary of War accordingly (Exhibit B).

4. NEW FILTRATION PLANT: Major J. A. O'Connor, Engineer Officer in Charge of Washington Work, submitted a revised sketch of the design of the new Filtration Plant, to be built near the District Line in connection with the new Conduit. The design was made to suggest a Georgian type of building,

to be in harmony it was said "with the general architectural atmosphere of Washington".

Mr. Medary and Mr. Delano saw no serious objection to adopting the new design, with certain changes which were explained to Major O'Connor and to Mr. Blake, his architect. Alternate studies were made for the tower, the one suggesting a temple at the top was disapproved; the other design of the tower showing a cupola was thought more acceptable, but it is to be improved; the pilasters are to be omitted from the tower; the break in the length of the building should be avoided and there should be less cornice and slightly arched windows. The Commission suggested that an 1/8" scale working drawing be made and brought to their attention at a future meeting.

✓ 5. INSPECTION OF SCULPTURE, FREER GALLERY OF ART: At the request of Mr. John Lodge, Curator, the Commission inspected the following objects proposed for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art:

1 Stone sculpture, Taoist divinities, Chinese, 7th century, A.D.

1 Stone sculpture, musicians and dancer, Chinese, 8th century, A.D.

1 Bronze, ceremonial vessel, Chinese, 10th century, B.C.

1 Pottery vase, Persian, 13th century, A.D.

The Commission approved the purchase of the objects (Exhibit C).

✓ 6. LOWER GARDEN, MERIDIAN HILL PARK: The Commission visited the office of Mr. H. W. Peaslee, architect, to consider revised studies which he was making, at the request of Lieut. Col. C. C. Sherrill, Officer in Charge of Public Buildings and Grounds, for the Lower Garden of Meridian Hill Park. Mr. Peaslee stated that he had been requested to make the drawings by Col. Sherrill with a view to a saving in cost of construction, so that the

project would meet with favor by Congress and appropriations made available to complete the park.

The Commission felt that as the entire design of the park had been carefully made and had for the most part been carried out, the amount that could be saved in the plan for the Lower Garden would be negligible and that it might seriously affect the appearance of the entire park to make any changes in the plan now. Mr. Greenleaf visited Meridian Hill Park with Mr. Moore and considered the matter very carefully with Mr. Peaslee on the ground.

Mr. Peaslee stated that according to the plans there would be a 13 foot wall along W Street, which Colonel Sherrill thought was unnecessarily high and which might be reduced to 4 or 5 feet, thereby saving possibly $30,000 in construction. Mr. Peaslee said he felt that 4 or 4½ feet was rather low, considering the height of the walls along the rest of the park, but that possibly a wall 6 feet high along W Street would be adequate when supplemented by planting. Mr. Greenleaf urged the importance of maintaining a high wall along W Street to serve as a base for the park. To lower the wall he feared would weaken it and affect the appearance of the park. Mr. Moore said the wall should be made high so that that part of the park would be on a level with the rest of the Lower Garden,--that a low wall near W Street would make that part of the park useless. The importance of maintaining a broad level for the Buchanan Memorial was also regarded very important.

An examination was made of the drawing of Meridian Hill Park, in which it was shown that there are two entrances proposed along W Street. Mr. Moore and Mr. Greenleaf thought these could be omitted and that instead an entrance to the park be provided at the southeast corner of the park; that the entire

stretch along W Street be maintained for a promenade, similar to the wall at St. Germain, Paris.

Mr. Peaslee said he would prepare studies for inspection by the Commission of the wall along W Street showing a promenade treatment, with a possible reduction in the height of the wall of a few feet, together with special treatment of the southwest corner of Meridian Hill Park, so as not to affect the appearance of the park along Sixteenth Street.

7. TRASH RECEPTACLE: On May 5, 1924, Col. Sherrill submitted photographs of a concrete trash receptacle, used in some of the better residential areas of Baltimore, concerning which he desired the advice of the Commission. Action thereon was postponed until the next meeting.

8. ENTRANCE TO ROCK CREEK PARK AT CALVERT STREET: Under date of May 15, 1924, Dr. T. S. Palmer of Washington submitted a letter to the Commission, suggesting an appropriate entrance to Rock Creek Park at Calvert Street, with a view to preventing the use of the area for commercial purposes.

The matter received special attention by Mr. Greenleaf, who visited the locality. Mr. Greenleaf questioned the necessity of creating a circle and an entrance to Rock Creek Park at Calvert Street, but regarded the matter of special interest and importance as a means of connecting the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway with Rock Creek Park and the Piney Branch Parkway. Mr.Greenleaf said he desired to make further study of the subject and give the matter further attention at the next meeting of the Commission.

The Commission were the guest of Mr. Charles S. Swift, President of the Manila Street Railway, for luncheon, on his house boat "Bolo". Mr. Swift took the members for a short trip down the Potomac River.

CONFERENCE OF FLAG STANDARDIZATION COMMITTEE OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 16, 1924.

In accordance with arrangements made, the Committee on Flag Standardization of the Department of Commerce met with the Commission of Fine Arts at the office of the Commission in the Interior Department Building on May 16, 1924, for a conference as to problems which had presented themselves with regard to the adoption of a standard United States Flag. The members of the Commission of Fine Arts present were: Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman, Mr. James L. Greenleaf, Mr. James E. Fraser, Mr. H. Siddons Mowbray, Mr. Milton B. Medary, Jr., and Mr. Wm. Adams Delano.

Representing the Committee on Flag Standardization of the Department of Commerce, there were present:

Mr. R. M. Hudson, Chairman, Department of Commerce,
Capt. J. Moultrie Ward, Q. M. C., United States Army,
Capt. W. G. DuBose, United States Navy,
Lieut. G. W. Nelson, United States Navy,
Mr. F. R. McGowan, Chief of Textile Section, Bureau of Standards,
Mr. Arthur L. Hayford, 1729 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.
Colonel Louis Annin Ames, President & Treasurer, Annin & Co., New York City,
Mr. Oscar S. Thompson, Secretary, New York Flag & Banner Co., New York City.

When the question of adopting a standard United States flag was submitted by the Department of Commerce to the Commission of Fine Arts, because of disparity in the dimensions of flags, as made by manufacturers, the Commission on May 18, 1923, recommended that the proportion of fly to hoist be as 1.67 to 1. This was considered at a Flag Standardization Conference held at the Department of Commerce on November 20, 1923, which was attended by representatives of manufacturers, distributers and users of United States flags, also by representatives of civic and patriotic organizations, and was very favorably regarded by them. But the question arose at the conference as to the proper dimension of the star circle diameter enclosing the stars, in relation to the suggested proportion of 1.67 to 1 and the present size of the union, which is 7 stripes hoist with the fly 3/4 the hoist of the flag. Therefore, on November 27, 1923, the Department of Commerce submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts the question "Can the star circle diameter be expressed as a definite proportion the width of the stripe? The great variation in the sizes of the stars used on flags of the same general proportions and dimensions warrants a specific recommendation on this point."

The Commission of Fine Arts considered the question at their meeting on December 14, 1923, at which time it seemed to the Commission that the simplest form to calculate the diameter of the star would be to base the diameter on the stripe, and a proportion of 3/4 of the width of the stripe was suggested. However, the Commission felt that the proper diameter of the circle enclosing the star could be determined only by means of a drawing. The Commission requested the following drawings:

1. A drawing of a "standard flag" based on the proposed new proportions,
2. A union, with the star circle diameter 3/4 of the width of the stripe, that could be superimposed on the union of design No. 1.

2. A drawing showing the 48 stars arranged on a diagonal, using a square union.

These drawings were submitted by the Department of Commerce at the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on February 1, 1924, when the Commission gave further consideration to the subject.

In studying the history of the flag, the Commission were surprised to find the many changes in proportions that the flag has undergone and is still undergoing. It seemed to the Commission desirable therefore to obtain some simple formula which could be used by all manufacturers, so that there shall be one flag as there is one country. After a prolonged consideration of the designs submitted, and reference to the historic flags of the United States, the Commission of Fine Arts recommended to the Department of Commerce that the proportions of the flag should be based on the width of the stripe. The number of stripes being 13 gives the figure 13 for the hoist; the fly should be to that width as 17 is to 21.

As to the union, the Commission advised that the union of the flag of the days of the Star Spangled Banner was square, but the increase in the number of States has made it undesirable to return to that proportion; the union should therefore be 7 stripes hoist and 8 stripes fly, with the star circle diameter 3/4 of the width of the stripe. The Commission requested for consideration at their next meeting a drawing of a United States flag, in colors, based on these suggested proportions.

The design, in the proportion of 13 to 21, was considered by the Commission at their meeting on March 21, 1924. The design appeared to the Commission considerably better than the drawing of the flag in the proportion of 1.67 to 1; but the arrangement of the stars seemed mechanical, and it was thought that this could be adjusted by alternating the stars, that is, every other star should be reversed. The Commission suggested that the stars be drawn somewhat closer together, leaving a wider margin of blue between the outer row of stars and the edge of the flag. The Commission felt that the proposed new proportion of 13 to 21, based on the width of the stripe, when worked out in its various proportions, would be much more preferable to flag manufacturers than the one based on the decimal system. The Commission therefore requested another drawing of a United States flag, in colors, for consideration at their next meeting, drawn in the proportion of 13 to 21, with the union as 7 is to 8, and the star circle diameter 3/4 of the width of the stripe, and showing the following:

1. A wider blue margin between the outer row of stars and the edge of the flag,
2. An alternate arrangement of the stars, i.e., every other star should be reversed,
3. Instead of having the points of the star sharp, they should be slightly rounded.

The Commission suggested vermillion red and ultramarine blue be used in coloring the design.

The design of the United States flag, drawn according to these recommendations, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their

meeting on April 23, 1924, and the members of the Commission were generally pleased with it. The alternate arrangement of the rounded stars, with a blue border on the edge of the union, destroyed its mechanical appearance and gave lustre to the constellation; it gave to the United States flag that quality which it should have as one beholds the flag, namely that it should be an inspiration.

The Commission recognized the fact that the new design would mean a radical change in the manufacture of flags, but felt it would bring about a great improvement in the present diversified conditions in the manufacture of United States flags and one which would meet with favor by the flag manufacturers. The Commission submitted their recommendations to the Department of Commerce in a report dated April 25, 1924, recommending the modular standard of measurement for the United States flag, in the proportion of 15 to 21, with the union as 7 is to 8 and the star circle diameter 3/4 of the width of the stripe, the stars arranged alternately; and suggesting a conference of the Committee on Flag Standardization of the Department of Commerce with the Commission of Fine Arts at their next meeting, on May 16,1924.

Mr. Hudson, Chairman of the Committee, briefly referred to the Conference held at the Department of Commerce in November, 1923, and stated that at this Conference there was almost a unanimous sentiment in favor of the recommendations made that the ratio of fly to hoist be as 1.37 to 1; that this Conference brought up the question of proportion of star circle diameter in its relation to the proposed new proportion of the flag, as the result of which the entire problem has received further consideration by the Commission of Fine Arts; and, as set forth in their letter of April 25th, instead of a flag based on the decimal system of measurement the modular system of measurement be adopted for the standard United States flag. Mr. Hudson stated that he felt the proportion of 15 to 21 would meet with favor, but that the greatest difficulty would be to agree upon the changes suggested in the union, particularly with reference to the rounded stars and alternating them. In considering the questions before the Commission and the Committee, Mr. Hudson said he hoped it would be possible to arrive at an understanding between both groups and that with all due consideration to the artistic side of the question, this

be considered in connection with the problems of the manufacturers of flags, the requirements of the Army and the Navy, and other large users of the flag. Mr. Hudson thereupon called upon various members of the Committee for their views on the subject:

Capt. J. Moultrie Ward, C. E. C., United States Army. Captain Ward said he was attracted by the scheme of proportions and thought it could be worked out along those lines. As to the arrangement of the stars, he said "I think the arrangement is good, but as to the shape of the stars I prefer not filling them out. We have found this very difficult when it comes to manufacturing. As to the colors, we have practically no difficulty in maintaining the standard shade in the blue and red of the silk flag, but we do have difficulty in bunting. We would not like to see any change in the existing Army standard of the silk colors because we have a great many publications referring to that color, and I do not see any particular reason either artistic or otherwise for making any change in the blue and the red,--that is I am talking now with reference to the standards of the Army blue and red. I think it would be a great mistake to adopt a lighter blue".

Colonel Louis Annin Ames, President & Treasurer, Annin & Co., Manufacturers of Flags and Banners, New York City.

Colonel Ames said he comes from a family that has been making flags for over 100 years; his firm was established in 1847. "I want to congratulate the Commission", Colonel Ames said, "on the proportion of 13 to 21. Not only have they selected a fine proportion, but there is also sentiment in this proportion, the 13 stripes representing the 13 original States, and 21 the National salute of 21 guns".

The difficulty of the union in that proportion is that there is going

to be difficulty in its manufacture, especially in the manufacture of the stars. It will cost about 200% more. The star is engraved and a die is cut to make the union. It will require twice as much time to make a field with the rounded stars, alternately arranged, than at present, and it is doubtful whether the field will be perfect after it is completed. The average now is 27 fields a day--the expert can run from 36 to 44. In regard to the mechanical arrangement of the stars, in the great mass of flags they do not come in the silk flags of the Army and of the Navy, nor the bunting flag of the Army and the Navy, but in the cheap cotten flag. By the present process we engrave and print one row of stars at a time and it can be repeated for 120 yards of one continuous field. That produces a flag according to a mechanical process, but it has its effect on the cost of production. If you alternate the stars it will be necessary to have two rows of stars on the die, and there will be a greater waste with each quantity of cloth printed. It is a serious difficulty. On the whole I think it will cost 300% more to manufacture the union. The expensive part of making the flag is in the union. With regard to the size of the star, I think the proportion of 3/4 of the width of the stripe very good, and I like the modular system better than the decimal. It is the easiest system in the world. If an order is issued pertaining to the flag with these new proportions, I would suggest it be made effective a year from the following Fourth of July, so as to permit manufacturers and dealers in flags to dispose of their existing stock.

Mr. Thompson, of the New York Flag & Banner Co., agreed with Colonel Ames that it is quite an item of increased expense to make the new star.

Captain J. G. DuBose, United States Navy: Captain DuBose said, "We were quite in favor of the 1.67 to 1, and as the suggested proportion of 21 to 13 is

equivalent to 1.615 to 1 there is no material difference in the size, and we are willing to subscribe to that. As regards the dimension of the field of the union, I think Colonel Ames has stated the difficulties involved, but I should like to emphasize this feature--a picture of a flag on a perfectly flat surface is different from a flag flowing in the breeze; and while it may appear perfectly square on paper and seem better from that point of view, it is better to have it rectangular. Concerning the stars, there is no question that alternating the stars is more artistic than the mechanical arrangement, but when it comes to the question of economy, question of cost, you must follow more or less the mechanical process. Also, I do not think it makes much difference up in the air whether you have the stars point up or point down, as they are not sufficiently distinct. If the new proportions are adopted the date should be fixed some time ahead of July 4th."

In the discussion which followed, Mr. Medary said he personally believed, from the standpoint of the Commission of Fine Arts, whose function it is to pass upon the artistic, that while difficulties may be feared now in the manufacture of the flag, based on these new proportions, here is a solution which has been reached as to what is considered the very best design for the United States flag. The flag is something to be honored and revered, and should be an inspiration. It is a symbol of the nation, and should be designed in the best manner possible.

Colonel Ames said he appreciated the desire on the part of the Commission and the Committee to secure a fine design, but felt that the price of the average flag should not be made prohibitive for the average buyer. Under the proposed plan the average 3 x 5 foot flag would have to sell for 75¢ more.

Mr. Mowbray regarded it unfortunate, since there is to be a change in the proportions of the flag, that no change is to be made in the red. In the long run he thought the red with its slight yellow element would retain its

complimentary color to the blue. Colonel [illegible] said he felt the question of color in the flag is one which should be left to chemists, because of the effect of the weather on flags and their durability.

The question was raised as to the ratio of the union of the flag according to the present "standard" flag 1.90 to 1, and that of the proposed proportion 13 to 21. Mr. Medary said, as to the actual calculation, in the same ratio the union of the proposed 13 to 21 flag should be as 7 is to 9. The ratio 7 to 8 had been recommended for the union, but it was thought desirable to make the proportion exact, and it was also thought a little more room between the stars might improve the appearance of the flag. The Commission of Fine Arts and the Committee agreed to the proportion of 7 to 9 for the union.

Mr. Hayford said it made the flag more artistic to alternate the stars but that it would be better to avoid anything fancy. The flag ought to be kept mechanical. It is not an ornament, entirely unlike a building or a monument; and being purely an emblem the flag ought to be made mechanically. Mr. Medary took decided exception to the statement that an emblem must be geometric, and recognizing the fact that Congress has specified the component parts of the flag, he thought the Commission of Fine Arts and the Committee were free to make the United States flag as beautiful as possible.

Mr. Greenleaf called attention to the beauty of foreign flags, mentioning in particular those in front of Saint Marks, Venice, which are wonderfully beautiful and inspiring. He felt inspiration and beauty should be put into our National flag and said this can be accomplished by alternating the stars, which gives to the flag also vivacity and brilliancy.

Mr. McGowan said, "The Bureau of the Budget has taken into consideration the specification of things through the Federal Specification Board. I do

not think the Bureau of the Budget would favor any increase in the cost of the flag. They want to buy it cheaply. It is not in line with the work we are doing to recommend anything which would involve the Government in additional expense".

Captain Ward said the flag manufactured according to the proposed new proportions would cost the Army slightly more than at present, but he thought there would be no material objection to this. Captain DuBose concurred in this on the part of the Navy. Colonel Ames said that it would cost about 20% more to manufacture the bunting flag. There is no desire to change the parade flag.

Mr. Moore thereupon suggested that the matters agreed upon be summarized, and Mr. Hudson replied in behalf of the Committee, "We have agreed upon all points with the exception of this pertaining to the star. We have had several meetings with the Commission, and this has now run for nearly 18 months from the time the subject was first taken up. It seems to me we are all agreed that the design showing the alternate star gives a better appearance to the flag, and it is only a question whether it would be practical to manufacture it in this way".

Colonel Ames thereupon offered to manufacture a flag based on the proposed new proportion, one showing the mechanical and the other the alternate arrangement of the stars, with a view to determining the difference in cost of production. Captain Ward and Captain DuBose promised similarly to have flags manufactured by the Army and the Navy. These flags will be submitted by the Committee on Flag Standardization to the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting in June and arrangements will be made to test them on a flagstaff.

EXHIBIT A.

COPY

May 15, 1924.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Your letter of May 12, transmitting a copy of a memorandum prepared for the Secretary of War by Lansing H. Beach, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, was presented to the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on May 10, 1924. The Commission direct me to transmit to you their action on the memorandum as follows:

The memorandum is unwarranted. An official of the Government exceeds his authority when he officially questions the action of a Government body in carrying out the purposes for which it was created and for executing a specific act of Congress in accordance with the plain letter of that law.

The memorandum is false in its statement of facts. The law provides that the tablet in question shall be placed upon the Francis Scott Key bridge under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The Act was approved January 30, 1924. On February 12th, Mr. Cuno H. Rudolph, President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, wrote to the Commission of Fine Arts, asking expedition on the part of the Commission in doing the duty imposed upon the Commission by the Act. The Commission reported in detail their advice, given after a personal inspection made by the entire membership of the Commission, as shown by the minutes. A letter similar to that sent to Commissioner Rudolph was transmitted to Senator George Wharton Pepper, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library. Whereupon Congress enacted a supplemental law making the change from bronze to marble. The tablet has been erected accordingly.

Whether the cost of a satisfactory and appropriate tablet did or did not put the proposed donor to more expense than that donor contemplated is immaterial to the Government. In this instance, however, the tablet was made and placed within the sum named by the society.

The memorandum is malicious in that it seeks to single out a member of the Commission of Fine Arts and to place on him personally a stigma for carrying out the action of the Commission, which action was in accordance with law.

Very respectfully yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Honorable

The Secretary of War.

EXHIBIT B.

C O P Y

May 19, 1924.

Dear Mr. Lodge:

The Commission of Fine Arts, on May 15, 1924, inspected the Chinese sculptures, submitted in your letter of May 14th.

The Commission unanimously approved the purchase of the objects; and also the purchase of the Persian jar inspected at the same time,--all for the Freer Gallery of Art.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. John E. Lodge, Curator,
The Freer Gallery of Art,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C.